

REMARKS

Claims 21-40 are pending. Claims 21, 26, 31, and 36 have been amended.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Patent Office rejected claims 21-31, 33-36 and 38-40 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Douma et al., US Patent 5,990,884 (Douma) in view of Humpleman et al., US Patent 6,288,716 B1 (Humpleman).

The Patent Office rejected claims 32 and 37 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Douma et al., U. S. Patent 5,990,884 (Douma) in view of Humpleman et al., U. S. Patent 6,288,716 B1 (Humpleman) and further in view of Naughton et al., U. S. Patent 6,020,881 (Naughton).

Applicant respectfully traverses each rejection. To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Ryoka*, 180 U.S.P.Q. 580 (C.C.P.A. 1974). *See also In re Wilson*, 165 U.S.P.Q. 494 (C.C.P.A. 1970). Applicant respectfully submits claims 21-40 which have not been disclosed, taught or suggested by Duoma, Humpleman and Naughton, individually or in combination. For example, claims 21, 26, 31, and 36 generally recite a system and method for generating a customized device user interface for an information handling system including modular user interface components whereby at least two of the modular user interface resource components are objects, the objects including common denominator functions for controlling a device and combining the objects to form a complete user interface for all functions of a device coupled to the information handling system. Duoma, Humpleman and Naughton fail to teach, disclose or suggest a system and method for generating a customized device user interface for an information handling system including modular user interface components whereby at least two of the modular user interface resource components are objects, the objects including common denominator functions for controlling a device and combining the objects to form a complete user interface for all functions of a device coupled to the information handling

system. Thus, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established for claims 21, 26, 31 and 36. Claims 21, 26, 31 and 36 are now believed allowable. Claims 22-25, 27-30, 32-35, and 37-40 are believed allowable due to their dependence on claims 21, 26, 31, and 36, respectively.

CONCLUSION

In light of the forgoing amendments, reconsideration of the claims is hereby requested, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicant

Chad W. Swantz

Reg. No. 46,329

Dated: March 28, 2005

Chad W. Swantz
Suiter West pc llo
14301 FNB Parkway, Suite 220
Omaha, Nebraska 68154
Telephone 402.496.0300
Facsimile 402.496.0333